

**PART E**

**HISTORIC ARTIFACT CATALOGING  
METHODS AND UTILIZED CODES**

# CONTENTS

	<b>PAGE</b>
I. ARTIFACT CATALOGING AND METHODS .....	E-1
A. Laboratory Processing .....	E-1
B. Analytical Methods .....	E-1
1. Historic Ceramic Methods of Analysis .....	E-2
2. Glass Methods of Analysis .....	E-3
3. Pipes Methods of Analysis .....	E-4
4. Small Finds/Architectural Methods of Analysis .....	E-5
5. Faunal Methods of Analysis .....	E-5
II. REFERENCES CITED .....	E-7
TRANSLATIONS OF UTILIZED CODES	

## I. ARTIFACT CATALOGING AND METHODS

### A. LABORATORY PROCESSING

All artifacts were transported from the field to Berger's laboratory in East Orange, New Jersey. In the field, artifacts were bagged in 4-mil resealable plastic bags, within paper bags. Artifact cards bearing provenience information were included in the plastic bags. The same information was written onto the paper bags. A field/catalog number was assigned to each unique provenience in the field, and this number appeared with all of the provenience information. The field/catalog number, along with the accession number obtained from the Delaware State Museum, was used to track artifact processing. The accession numbers assigned to the site are as follows: 97/0051, 97/0052, and 97/0053 for the Phase I; 97/0055, 97/0058, and 97/0059 for the Phase II; and 98/0002 for the Phase III.

In the laboratory, provenience information on each artifact card and bag was checked against a master list of accession/field/catalog numbers with their proveniences. Any discrepancies were corrected at this time and the artifact bags were sorted by accession/field/catalog number for washing and analysis.

Historic artifacts were washed with a soft toothbrush, in de-ionized soap (Orvis) and water. Fragile or unstable artifacts, such as overglaze-decorated ceramics and some shell, were cleaned with a wet toothbrush, without immersion, or were simply dry-brushed. Prehistoric lithics not chosen for blood residue analysis were washed in water, and prehistoric ceramics were simply dry-brushed with a soft-bristled paint brush. All artifacts were laid out to air-dry, sorted by accession/field/catalog number. Within each accession/field/catalog number, the artifacts were separated into material classes for analysis: historic ceramics, curved (vessel) glass, tobacco pipes, small finds/architectural, faunal, shell, prehistoric lithics, and prehistoric ceramics.

Artifacts were marked with the appropriate Delaware State Museum accession number as well as the field/catalog number on a base of Roplex mixed with water. If an artifact had been further identified by an artifact number, this number was included in the label and was placed after the field/catalog number. The label was then sealed with a top coat of PVA mixed with acetone. After analysis, the artifacts were re-bagged in clean, 4-mil, resealable plastic bags with air holes. An acid-free artifact card with provenience information, accession number, and field/catalog number was included in the bags. Before shipment to the Delaware State Museum, the collection will be prepared according to the curation standards of that institution.

### B. ANALYTICAL METHODS

A computerized data management system developed by Berger was used to compile an artifact inventory for data manipulation. The system is written on an IBM PC using R:BASE System V, a relational database development package. Artifact information (characteristics) was recorded on the data entry forms by the analysts and was entered into the system. The system was then used to enhance the artifact records with the addition of provenience information. A second program added dates (when applicable) and translations for all artifact Type and Subtype codes. This system is used for coding all historic and prehistoric artifacts: ceramics, glass, smoking pipes, small finds/architectural materials, lithics, and prehistoric ceramics. It is also used for coding faunal materials, whether they originated in historic deposits or prehistoric deposits.

Pattern (group and class) codes, based on form or material type, were automatically assigned by the computer to each artifact entry, although for non-kitchen-related ceramics, Pattern codes, based on identified forms, were entered by hand. The purpose of artifact pattern analysis is to organize an assemblage and provide a description of its contents. The pattern categories used follow the work of South (1977), as modified by Berger (1987).

Artifact Function codes were generated only for historic ceramics and glass. Functional analysis is used as a supplement to pattern analysis to examine the proportions of vessel functional categories within assemblages. The functional categories used follow Beidleman et al. (1983) and Klein and Garrow (1984), as modified by Berger (1987). Ceramic Function codes are linked to identified vessel forms and were entered into the system manually. The Function codes for glass, however, are linked to the Type/Subtype codes and were therefore assigned automatically by the computer.

Procedures for historic artifact analysis, including definitions of the analytical fields (with the modifiers or variables [VAR] used for this collection), are presented below. The procedures used in analyzing this collection are based on those described in Berger 1996.

Procedures used for cataloging prehistoric lithic artifacts are described in Part C of this volume. Procedures used for analyzing the prehistoric pottery are discussed in Appendix H of Volume II. Analysis of the archaeobotanical data is discussed in Appendix C of Volume II.

### *1. Historic Ceramic Methods of Analysis*

The ceramic collection from the site was analyzed using a standardized format developed by Berger. This format is based on the South/Noël Hume typology (South 1977), as modified for use in a computerized system (Berger 1987; Stehling in Geismar 1983; Stehling and Janowitz 1986).

The ceramic tabulation was performed at a Stage 1 level of analysis. Stage 1 analysis provides the following information: identification of ware types and techniques of surface decoration; dates based on manufacturing and decorative techniques and, if present, makers' marks; identification of vessel forms and functions; and description of decorative motifs. Only the part (VAR 7) field was not utilized for this site. The following are the variables used in the computer coding process.

**Type/Subtype.** The ceramic Type/Subtype is entered as a five-character alphanumeric code that consists of three letters and two digits. The first letter is always C, for Ceramic. The second letter refers to general ware groups: E, for Coarse Earthenwares; R, for Refined Earthenwares; S, for Coarse Stonewares; F, for Refined Stonewares; P, for Porcelain; and O, for Other and Unidentified. The third letter refers to specific ware types: e.g., R, for Redware; W, for Whiteware; and L, for Gray Stoneware. The numbers following the letter code refer to particular decorative treatments or named types: e.g., CRW50 - Whiteware with Blue Transfer-Printed Decoration. Type/Subtype may have specific dates or may be descriptive and undated. Sources for the dates include, but are not limited to, Cameron (1986), Denker and Denker (1985), Howard (1984), Ketchum (1983), Miller (1980, 1987, 1991), Noël Hume (1970), South (1977), and Wetherbee (1985).

**Count.** The number of sherds in each category was recorded in this field.

**Begin Date/End Date.** The beginning and end dates were automatically assigned by the computer to each dated Type/Subtype. When more precise dates could be determined from makers' marks or particular decorations or forms, or when a generally undated type could be dated, this field was filled in on the coding sheet and the more specific dates were entered into the computer.

**Maker's Mark (VAR 1).** The Maker's Mark field is used to record the actual marks seen on sherds. The dates listed in the utilized codes are the broadest manufacturing ranges for the pertinent potters or firms; when a particular mark indicated a narrower date range, the more precise date was used. Sources used for the identification of makers' marks from this collection are Barber (1968), Gates and Ormerod (1982), Godden (1964), and Lehner (1988).

**Decoration/Motif (VAR 4).** This field includes descriptions of particular decorative motifs (e.g., Floral ), specific pattern names (e.g., Willow), and general descriptions (e.g., Glazed Interior Only).

**Form (VAR 5).** Form indicates the shape and possible function of the complete vessel as represented by the sherds present. General categories, such as Body - General, are used for sherds whose small size or ambiguous characteristics make determination of form problematical. Definitions of forms are based, for the most part, on Beaudry et al. (1983), Greer (1981), Ketchum (1983), and Towner (1963).

**Color (VAR 9).** This is a supplemental field that is designed to provide information about the color of a decoration or glaze; it is used only when color is not part of the information contained in the Type/Subtype or Decoration/Motif fields.

**Comments.** The Comments code is numerical and refers to information not covered in the other fields.

**Function.** This field refers to the following general functional categories: Teawares; Tablewares; Beverage (Non-Tea); Food Preparation; Food Storage; Hygiene; Household Furnishings; Toys; Miscellaneous (flowerpots, ink bottles, etc.); Multi-functional; Pharmaceutical; Crucibles; Bottles; Kiln-Related Artifacts; and Unidentifiable Fragments.

**Pattern.** The Pattern (Group and Class) codes are based on the system developed by South (1977) but differ from South in that they are dependent upon identifiable vessel forms. The majority of ceramic sherds are assigned the code 101 (Kitchen-Related Ceramics) but some sherds are assigned other codes: for instance, flower pots are pattern code 856 (Activities-Household Related).

**Notes.** The Notes field allows for individual, written comments applicable to a specific entry. In general, notes were used to describe particulars of decorative motifs or unusual characteristics, or to record bibliographic references used for identification or dating.

## *2. Glass Methods of Analysis*

The glass artifacts from the site were broken down for analytical purposes into four functionally distinct groupings based on Bottle, Table, Lighting, and Other use-categories. Window glass, considered more functionally inclusive under an architectural group of artifacts, was subsumed for analysis under Small Finds/Architectural Materials, discussed below.

Identification and tabulation of the glass proceeded according to a Modified Stage 1 level of analysis. The modified analysis involved, in addition to Type/Subtype and count designations, the recordation of dates, if applicable, and one descriptive attribute of the sherds (e.g., color). The glass analysis utilized the typology and attribute list designed by Berger for all its projects. In addition to accession, field/catalog, and provenience information, a total of six fields of discrete glass data were available for recordation on the computer data entry sheets.

Pattern (group and class) and Function codes for glass, as previously stated, were assigned automatically by the computer, based on the Type/Subtype entered for each artifact. The only category of glass that did not receive a function designation was totally unidentified glass. A brief description of coding procedures follows.

**Type/Subtype.** Tabulation of the glass proceeded according to artifact codes determined by function (Type) and form (Subtype). Codes are alphanumeric and consist of three letters and a two-digit number. The first letter, G, standard for all codes, denotes the artifact as Glass. The second letter denotes the general functional category in which the artifact falls: B, for Bottle; T, for Table; L, for Lighting-related; and O, for Other glass. The third letter denotes specific function, e.g., A, for Alcohol, under the general Bottle heading; T, for Tumbler, under the general Table heading; L, for Lamp, under the general Lighting-related heading; and U, for Unidentified, under the general Other heading. The two-digit number completes the identification and denotes vessel form: e.g., GBA01 - Wine Bottle; GTT10 - Tumbler/Commercial; GLL24 - Lamp Globe/Chimney; and GOU01 - Total Unidentified Glass.

All artifacts identified as to specific function and form were coded as such regardless of the degree of fragmentation. Complete and fragmented bases, finishes, rims, and body sherds for which specific functional forms could not be identified were accommodated under unidentified, miscellaneous, or fragment categories. Non-form-specific vessels and sherds were coded as above, when appropriate, or under expanded codes such as Wine/Liquor Bottle.

**Count.** The number of sherds in each category was recorded in this field.

**Begin Date/End Date.** Dating of the glass artifacts proceeded according to established diagnostic criteria. These criteria, utilized either singly or in combination, can include various technological aspects of glass manufacture such as finish treatments, tooling methods, empontrilling techniques, mold markings, datable bottle embossments and makers' marks, and various stylistic elements associated with certain tablewares. When applicable, both a beginning and an end date of manufacture were recorded. In instances where no end date of manufacture was available, only the beginning date or the Terminus Post Quem (TPQ) for the artifact was recorded. Sources used for glass dating include Jones and Sullivan (1985), Kovel and Kovel (1986), Munsey (1970), and Toulouse (1971, 1977).

**Color (VAR 6).** In general, color was assigned to glass artifacts purely for descriptive purposes and was broadly defined for this collection. All shades of olive green, for example, were coded under Light Olive/Dark Olive Green. The exception is the color amethyst-tinted (or solarized), which is temporally diagnostic. The code Unidentified was used to denote glass color that was obscured, for example, by burning or devitrification.

### *3. Pipes Methods of Analysis*

Pipes are generally tabulated by morphological type, decorative motif, maker's mark, use wear, and stem bore diameter. The analysis is designed to describe the pipes and to generate dates whenever possible. The single pipe in the collection was tabulated at a Stage 1 level of analysis, which included the following variables.

**Type/Subtype.** The Type/Subtype code for the pipe is alphanumeric and consists of three letters and two digits. The first two letters are PT, indicating "Pipes - Tobacco." The third letter, "E," identifies the artifact as a general white clay bowl. The numerical Subtype code, "98," further defines the artifact as an Unidentified Shape Bowl.

**Count.** The number of pipe fragments was recorded in this field.

**Use (VAR 3).** This modifier describes the type of use found on the pipe, e.g., light.

#### *4. Small Finds/Architectural Methods of Analysis*

The small finds/architectural materials received a Stage 1 level of analysis using the coding system created by Berger, based on the South/Noël Hume typology (South 1977). The Stage 1 coding system allows for a maximum of 14 fields of information for each artifact. At a minimum, each artifact was identified by its group and class, material type, and received a count or weight designation. For certain artifact types, additional descriptive information, such as weight and color, was coded. The remaining fields of information were used only if further information was provided by the artifact. Only the decoration (VAR 4), characteristic (VAR 5), and comments fields were not utilized for this site. Pattern (group and class) codes were automatically assigned by the program. Following is a brief description of coding procedures.

**Type/Subtype.** The Type/Subtype code is alphanumeric and consists of three letters and two digits. The first letter is always S, for Small Finds/Architectural; the second letter denotes Group (e.g., A, for Architecture); and the third letter denotes a class within a group (e.g., F, for Fasteners). The numerical Subtype code denotes the specific artifact type: e.g., SAF03 - Machine-Cut Nail.

**Count.** All artifacts, except heating byproducts, were counted and the total was entered in this field.

**Weight.** Weights were recorded for window glass, brick, mortar, and heating byproducts.

**Begin Date/End Date.** Dates for certain artifacts were generated automatically by the computer based on their Type/Subtype. Other dates are hand-entered into the computer based on artifact characteristics. References used for dating of artifacts included Albert and Kent (1949), Chernow and Vallasi (1993), Hogg (1985), Johnson (1942), Lamm et al. (1970), Lavitt (1983), Luscomb (1967), Munsey (1970), Nelson (1968), Noël Hume (1970), Peacock (1968), and Pepper (1971).

**Maker's Mark (VAR 1).** Makers' marks were recorded.

**Material (VAR 3).** The material composition of each artifact was determined and recorded.

**Color (VAR 6).** Color was recorded for window glass and for some artifacts, such as marbles.

**Backmark (VAR 11).** Any mark other than a maker's mark was recorded here.

**Notes.** The Notes field allows for additional, written comments.

#### *5. Faunal Methods of Analysis*

The faunal material received a Modified Stage 1 level of analysis using the coding system created by Berger. This level of analysis allows for identification of species and element. Identifications were made with the aid of a comparative faunal type collection and the use of reference materials, which include Gilbert (1973) and Olsen (1964, 1968, 1979).

**Type/Subtype.** The Type/Subtype code is alphanumeric and consists of three letters and two digits. The first letter is always Z, which indicates Faunal; the second letter denotes the class; and the third letter distinguishes groups within a class: e.g., D, for Domestic. The numerical Subtype code indicates the species: e.g., 60 - Pig.

**Count.** The Count indicates the Total Number of Fragments (TNF) for bone and gastropods.

**Weight.** Shell fragments were weighed.

**Element (VAR 5).** This field indicates the bone, or element, quantified.

## II. REFERENCES CITED

- Abbott, R. Tucker  
1968 *Seashells of North America*. Golden Press, New York.  
1985 *Seashells of the World*. Golden Press, New York.
- Albert, Lillian Smith, and Kathryn Kent  
1949 *The Complete Button Book*. Doubleday and Company, Garden City, New York.
- Barber, Edwin Atlee  
1968 *Marks of American Potters*. Cracker Barrel Press, Southampton, New York. Reprint of 1904 edition. Patterson and White, Philadelphia.
- Beaudry, Mary, Janet Long, Henry M. Miller, Fraser D. Neiman, and Gary Wheeler Stone  
1983 A Vessel Typology for Early Chesapeake Ceramics: The Potomac Typological System. *Historical Archaeology* 17(1):18-43.
- Beidleman, D.K., T.E. Davidson, R. Napoli, R. Wheeler, and M. Weiss  
1983 Creating a Database: The City's Test Square. In *Approaches to Preserving a City's Past*. Alexandria Urban Archaeology Program. City of Alexandria, Virginia.
- Berger (see Louis Berger & Associates, Inc.)
- Cameron, Elisabeth  
1986 *Encyclopedia of Pottery & Porcelain: 1800-1960*. Facts on File Publications, New York.
- Chernow, Barbara A., and George A Vallasi (editors)  
1993 *The Columbia Encyclopedia*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Denker, Ellen, and Bert Denker  
1985 *The Main Street Pocket Guide to North American Pottery and Porcelain*. The Main Street Press, Pittstown, New Jersey.
- Gates, William C., and Dana E. Ormerod  
1982 The East Liverpool, Ohio, Pottery District: Identification of Manufacturers and Marks. *Historical Archaeology* 16(1-2):1-358.
- Geismar, Joan  
1983 *The Archaeological Investigation of the 175 Water Street Block, New York City*. Prepared for HRO International, New York, by Soil Systems Division, Professional Services Industries, Inc., Marietta, Georgia.
- Gilbert, Miles  
1973 *Mammalian Osteo-Archaeology*. The Missouri Archaeological Society, Inc., Columbia, Missouri.

- Godden, Geoffrey A.  
1964 *Encyclopedia of British Pottery and Porcelain Marks*. Schiffer Publishing, Exton, Pennsylvania.
- Greer, Georgiana  
1981 *American Stonewares: The Art and Craft of Utilitarian Potters*. Schiffer Publishing, Exton, Pennsylvania.
- Hogg, Ian V.  
1985 *The Illustrated Encyclopedia of Ammunition*. Catwell Books, Secaucus, New Jersey.
- Howard, David Sanctuary  
1984 *New York and the China Trade*. The New York Historical Society, New York.
- Hunter, Robert R., Jr., and George L. Miller  
1994 English Shell-Edged Earthenware. *The Magazine Antiques* CXLV(3):432-443.
- Johnson, D.F.  
1942 *The American Historical Button*. David F. Johnson, New Market, New Jersey.
- Jones, Olive R., and Catherine Sullivan  
1985 *The Parks Canada Glass Glossary*. Studies in Archaeology, Architecture and History. National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, Parks Canada, Ottawa.
- Ketchum, William C.  
1983 *Pottery and Porcelain*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York.
- Klein, Terry, and Patrick H. Garrow  
1984 *Final Archaeological Investigations at the Wilmington Boulevard, Monroe Street to King Street, Wilmington, New Castle County, Delaware*. DELDOT Archaeology Series No. 29. Delaware Department of Transportation, Dover.
- Kovel, Ralph M., and Terry H. Kovel  
1961 *A Dictionary of American Silver, Pewter, and Silver Plate*. Crown Publishers, New York.  
1986 *Kovel's New Dictionary of Marks*. Crown Publishers, New York.
- Lamm, Ruth, Beatrice Lorah, Lester Lorah, and Helen W. Schuler  
1970 *Guidelines for Collecting China Buttons*. The National Button Society, Boyertown, Pennsylvania.
- Lavitt, Wendy  
1983 *Dolls*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York.
- Lehner, Lois  
1988 *Lehner's Encyclopedia of U.S. Marks on Pottery, Porcelain & Clay*. Collector Books, Paducah, Kentucky.

- Lentz, Austin N.  
 1959 *Common Forest Trees of New Jersey*. Extension Service, College of Agriculture, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
- Louis Berger & Associates, Inc. [Berger]  
 1987 *Druggists, Craftsmen, and Merchants of Pearl and Water Streets, New York: The Barclays Bank Site*. Prepared for London and Leeds Corporation, New York, and Barclays Bank PLC, New York, by the Cultural Resource Group, Louis Berger & Associates, Inc., East Orange, New Jersey.
- 1996 *Analytical Coding System for Historic Period Artifacts*. Prepared by Sharla Azizi, Diane Dallal, Mallory A. Gordon, Meta F. Janowitz, Nadia N.S. Maczaj, and Marie-Lorraine Pipes. The Cultural Resource Group, Louis Berger & Associates, Inc., East Orange, New Jersey.
- Luscomb, Sally C.  
 1967 *The Collector's Encyclopedia of Buttons*. Crown Publishers, New York.
- Martin, Alexander, and William Barkley  
 1961 *Seed Identification Manual*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Miller, George L.  
 1980 Classification and Economic Scaling of 19th Century Ceramics. *Historical Archaeology* 14:1-40.
- 1987 Origins of Josiah Wedgwood's Pearlware. *Northeast Historical Archaeology* 16:80-92.
- 1991 A Revised Set of CC Index Values for Classification and Economic Scaling of English Ceramics from 1787 to 1880. *Historical Archaeology* 25:1-25.
- Munsey, Cecil  
 1970 *The Illustrated Guide to Collecting Bottles*. Hawthorn Books, New York.
- Nelson, Lee H.  
 1968 Nail Chronology as an Aid to Dating Old Buildings. *Historic News* 24:11.
- Noël Hume, Ivor  
 1970 *A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York.
- Olsen, Stanley J.  
 1964 *Mammal Remains from Archaeological Sites*. Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology 56(1). Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- 1968 *Fish, Amphibian and Reptile Remains from Archaeological Sites*. Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology 56(2). Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- 1979 *Osteology for the Archaeologist*. Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology 56(3, 4, and 5). Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

- Oswald, Adrian  
 1961      The Evolution and Chronology of English Clay Tobacco Pipes. *The Archaeological News Letter* 7(3):55-62.
- Peacock, Primrose  
 1968      *Antique Buttons, Their History and How to Collect Them*. Drake Publishers, New York.
- Pepper, Adeline  
 1971      *The Glass Gaffers of New Jersey and Their Creations from 1739 to the Present*. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
- South, Stanley  
 1977      *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology*. Academic Press, New York.
- Stehling, Nancy A., and Meta F. Janowitz  
 1986      A Coding System for Computer Tabulation of Historic Ceramics. Paper presented at the 1986 CNEHA conference at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, New York.
- Toulouse, Julian Harrison  
 1971      *Bottle Makers and Their Marks*. Thomas Nelson, Inc., New York.
- 1977      *Fruit Jars*. Everybody's Press, Hanover, Pennsylvania.
- Towner, Donald  
 1963      *The Leeds Pottery*. Cory, Adams and Mackay, London.
- Walker, Iain C.  
 1977      *Clay Tobacco Pipes, with Particular Reference to the Bristol Industry*. History and Archaeology No. 11. National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, Parks Canada, Ottawa.
- 1983      Nineteenth-Century Clay Tobacco Pipes in Canada. In *The Archaeology of the Clay Tobacco Pipe VIII: America*, pp. 1-88. BAR International Series 175. Oxford, England.
- Wetherbee, Jean  
 1985      *A Second Look at White Ironstone*. Wallace-Homestead Book Co., Des Moines, Iowa.